

REMARKS

Claims 10 and 23 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added by way of this response. Thus, claims 10-12, 14 17-19, and 22-35 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Objections to the Claims:

Claims 10 and 26 have been amended to incorporate suggestions of the Examiner and therefore Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the claim objections.

Response to Rejections Under Section 102:

Claims 10-12, 14, 17-19, 22-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b), the Examiner contending that these claims are anticipated by Coussement (US PGPub 2002/0114278).

Applicants' Claim 10 recites:

a memory having an address of the monitoring component when the respective component is being monitored,

The Examiner indicates that this limitation is provided by a storage in par. [0004] and [0014], contact histories, reporting statistics, routing rules in par. [0016], and a memory in par. [0023]. Applicants respectfully submit that a mere presence of a storage and/or memory does not teach or suggest that an address of the monitoring component (when the respective component is being monitored) is stored. Likewise, statistical data, and routing rules, and a call history that provides a list of previous calls does not teach or suggest that an address of the monitoring component is stored. Applicants' Claim 10 further recites:

each component is: ... monitorable by each of the other components via the processing unit, and equipped for monitoring each of the other components via the communication unit.

Thus, each component may be a monitor and each component may be monitored by each component. In contrast, Coussement teaches only the proxy agent (18) acts as a monitor (see e.g., para. [0068]). Coussement does not teach or suggest that the workstation agent (43, 45, 47) may monitor the proxy agent (18). Furthermore, Coussement teaches a hierarchical monitoring structure where the proxy agent (18) only monitors a workstation agent (43, 45, 47) or proxy

agent (18) at a lower level (see e.g., para. [0068]-[0069]). Thus, Coussement's does not teach or suggest that each component may be a monitor and each component may be monitored by each component.

In view of the above, claim 10 is not anticipated by Coussement. Likewise, independent claim 23 is not anticipated by Coussement. Furthermore, claims 11, 12, 14, 17-19, 22 and 33-35 which depends on claim 10 and claims 24-32 which depend on claim 23 are also patentable at least based on their dependency as well as based on their own merits.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Section 102 rejections.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 03-04-2008

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830